

Mayer, Fortkort & Williams, PC  
251 North Avenue West. 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Westfield, NJ 07090

---

## Fax Cover Sheet

DATE:	November 16, 2002	PAGES:	<u>3 (three) w/cover</u>
TO:	Examiner Tan N. Tran GAU 2826	PHONE:	(703) 305-3362
		FAX:	(703) 872-9318
FROM:	Karin L. Williams Mayer, Fortkort & Williams, PC	PHONE:	(908) 518-7700
		FAX:	(908) 518-7795

---

## Message

### DOCKET GS150

Please see attached: Response to Restriction Requirement

**FAX RECEIVED**

NOV 16 2002

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

---

### CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

This facsimile transmission is intended only for the use of the addressee and may contain confidential information which is protected by the attorney/client privilege. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by telephone to arrange for its return.

#7  
Elective  
11/19/02  
ang

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant: Iuan Hshich et al.  
Serial No.: 10/010,484  
Filed: November 20, 2001  
Title: Trench MOSFET Device with Polycrystalline Silicon Source Contact Structure  
Art Unit: 2826  
Examiner: Tan N. Tran }  
Docket No.: GS 150

**FAX RECEIVED**

NOV 16 2002

Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800**

**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated October 18, 2002, kindly consider the following response to the outstanding restriction requirement.

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. Restriction was required to the following allegedly distinct inventions:

I. Claims 1-16, drawn to a semiconductor device, classified in class 257, subclass 330.

II. Claims 17-21, drawn to a method of manufacturing a semiconductor device, classified in class 438, subclass 259.

The Office Action indicates that the inventions are distinct because "the device of the group I invention could be made by a process materially different than that of the group II invention".